REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18 and 20-29 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 10, and 18 are amended herein. Claims 27-29 are new.

103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,841,424) in view of SanGiovanni (2002/0102946 A1) and Batio (5,949,643). Applicant has reviewed Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-6 and 9 are not obvious in view of Kikinis, SanGiovanni, and Batio, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully states that the Independent Claim 1 includes the limitations "said keyboard portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." These limitations are supported in the Specification and the Figures. These limitations are not taught or rendered obvious over Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio.

The Applicant understands Kikinis to teach a keyboard which may also act as a docking station for a plurality of hand held devices. However, Kikinis does not teach a portable keyboard sled. Applicant understands Kikinis (as shown in Figure 1) to teach a keyboard compatible with USB protocols which connects with a USB port on a PC. Furthermore, Applicant understands

Kikinis to teach (column 4 lines 49-60) that the keyboard may perform various functions such as synchronizing files with a connected PC, downloading data of various sorts and the like, and also recharge at the same time, automatically. That is, Kikinis requires a PC coupled with the keyboard acting as a docking station for interaction with the portable computer system of the instant application.

Furthermore, Applicant understands Kikinis to teach (column 5 lines 10-15) that in one embodiment there may be no keyboard, but just a row of ports, with one common USB port for connection to a PC. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Kikinis. In addition, Applicant respectfully states that Kikinis actually teaches away from the claimed limitations, "a portable keyboard sled" and "allowing a user to communicatively interact with the portable computer system via standard input components of the portable computing system." Furthermore, Kikinis fails to address the limitation of the user being able to communicatively interact with the portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system.

With respect to SanGiovanni, Applicant respectfully states that SanGiovanni alone or in combination with Kikinis fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said keyboard portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." Applicant understands SanGiovanni to teach a wireless communications device connected with a PDA. Applicant further

understands SanGiovanni to teach (paragraph 0032) that his apparatus contains an additional input terminal for connecting an input device such as a keyboard. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that there is no suggestion or motivation by SanGiovanni to modify his invention to reach the desirability of the claimed invention. Specifically MPEP 2143.01 states that "the fact that a reference can be combined is not sufficient to establish obviousness." Specifically, SanGiovanni mentions only a port for connecting a peripheral device, but teaches nothing about a keyboard portion much less a portable keyboard portion or any suggestion or motivation for such.

With respect to Batio, Applicant respectfully states that Batio alone or in combination with Kikinis and SanGiovanni fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said keyboard portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." Applicant understands Batio to teach a portable computer having a split keyboard. Applicant further understands Batio to teach his keyboard as a retrofit for a notebook computer, or to be used in place of the standard input components of a notebook computing system. Applicant understands Batio to teach away from using the portable keyboard as a means for communicatively interacting with the portable computing system while also maintaining the standard input components as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 4-6

and 9 are dependent on Independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Claims 10, 12 and 14-15

Claims 10, 12, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,841,424) in view of SanGiovanni (2002/0102946 A1) and Batio (5,949,643). Applicant has reviewed Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-6 and 9 are not obvious in view of Kikinis, SanGiovanni, and Batio, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully states that the Independent Claim 10 includes the limitations "said gaming controls portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable gaming sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." These limitations are supported in the specification and the Figures. These limitations are not taught or rendered obvious over Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio.

The Applicant understands Kikinis to teach a keyboard which may also act as a docking station for a plurality of hand held devices. However, Kikinis does not teach a portable gaming sled. Applicant understands Kikinis (as shown in Figure 1) to teach a keyboard compatible with USB protocols which

connects with a USB port on a PC. Furthermore, Applicant understands Kikinis to teach (column 4 lines 49-60) that the keyboard may perform various functions such as synchronizing files with a connected PC, downloading data of various sorts and the like, and also recharge at the same time, automatically. That is, Kikinis requires a PC coupled with the keyboard acting as a docking station for interaction with the portable computer system of the instant application.

Furthermore, Applicant understands Kikinis to teach (column 5 lines 10-15) that in one embodiment there may be no keyboard, but merely a row of ports, with one common USB port for connection to a PC. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Kikinis. In addition, Applicant respectfully states that Kikinis actually teaches away from the claimed limitations, "a portable keyboard sled" and "allowing a user to communicatively interact with the portable computer system via standard input components of the portable computing system." Furthermore, Kikinis fails to address the limitation of the user being able to communicatively interact with the portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system.

With respect to SanGiovanni, Applicant respectfully states that SanGiovanni alone or in combination with Kikinis fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said gaming controls portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said <u>portable</u> gaming sled <u>while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system</u>." Applicant understands SanGiovanni to

teach a wireless communications device connected with a PDA. Applicant further understands SanGiovanni to teach (paragraph 0032) that his apparatus contains an additional input terminal for connecting an input device such as a keyboard. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that there is no suggestion or motivation by SanGiovanni to modify his invention to reach the desirability of the claimed invention. Specifically MPEP 2143.01 states that "the fact that a reference can be combined is not sufficient to establish obviousness." Specifically, SanGiovanni mentions only a port for connecting a peripheral device, but teaches nothing about a gaming controls portion much less a portable gaming controls portion or any suggestion or motivation for such.

With respect to Batio, Applicant respectfully states that Batio alone or in combination with Kikinis and SanGiovanni fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said gaming controls portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable gaming sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." Applicant understands Batio to teach a portable computer having a split keyboard. Applicant further understands Batio to teach his keyboard as a retrofit for a notebook computer, or to be used in place of the standard input components of a notebook computing system. Applicant understands Batio to teach away from using the portable gaming device as a means for communicatively interacting with the portable computing system while also maintaining the standard input components as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 12 and 14-15 are dependent on Independent Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 12 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Claims 18, and 21-24

Claims 18 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,841,424) in view of SanGiovanni (2002/0102946 A1) and Batio (5,949,643). Applicant has reviewed Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 18 and 21-24 are not obvious in view of Kikinis, SanGiovanni, and Batio, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully states that the Independent Claim 18 includes the limitations "said keyboard portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system." These limitations are supported in the specification and the Figures. These limitations are not taught or rendered obvious over Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio.

The Applicant understands Kikinis to teach a keyboard which may also act as a docking station for a plurality of hand held devices. However, Kikinis does not teach a portable keyboard sled. Applicant understands Kikinis (as shown in Figure 1) to teach a keyboard compatible with USB protocols which connects with a USB port on a PC. Furthermore, Applicant understands Kikinis to teach (column 4 lines 49-60) that the keyboard may perform various functions such as synchronizing files with a connected PC, downloading data of various sorts and the like, and also recharge at the same time, automatically. That is, Kikinis requires a PC coupled with the keyboard acting as a docking station for interaction with the portable computer system of the instant application.

Furthermore, Applicant understands Kikinis to teach (column 5 lines 10-15) that in one embodiment there may be no keyboard, but just a row of ports, with one common USB port for connection to a PC. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the claimed embodiment is not obvious in view of Kikinis. In addition, Applicant respectfully states that Kikinis actually teaches away from the claimed limitations, "a portable keyboard sled" and "allowing a user to communicatively interact with the portable computer system via standard input components of the portable computing system." Furthermore, Kikinis fails to address the limitation of the user being able to communicatively interact with the portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system.

With respect to SanGiovanni, Applicant respectfully states that SanGiovanni alone or in combination with Kikinis fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said keyboard portion allowing a user to

communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled <u>while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system.</u>" Applicant understands SanGiovanni to teach a wireless communications device connected with a PDA. Applicant further understands SanGiovanni to teach (paragraph 0032) that his apparatus contains an additional input terminal for connecting an input device such as a keyboard. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that there is no suggestion or motivation by SanGiovanni to modify his invention to reach the desirability of the Claimed limitations. Specifically MPEP 2143.01 states that "the fact that a reference can be combined is not sufficient to establish obviousness." Specifically, SanGiovanni mentions only a port for connecting a peripheral device, but teaches nothing about a keyboard portion much less a <u>portable</u> keyboard portion or any suggestion or motivation for such.

With respect to Batio, Applicant respectfully states that Batio alone or in combination with Kikinis and SanGiovanni fails to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations of "said keyboard portion allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via said portable keyboard sled <u>while also allowing a user to communicatively interact with said portable computing system via a standard input component of the portable computing system.</u>" Applicant understands Batio to teach a portable computer having a split keyboard. Applicant further understands Batio to teach his keyboard as a retrofit for a notebook computer, or to be used in place of the standard input components of a notebook computing system. Applicant understands Batio to teach away from using the portable keyboard

as a means for communicatively interacting with the portable computing system while also maintaining the standard input components as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claim 18 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 21-24 are dependent on Independent Claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Claims 3, 13 and 20

Claims 3, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,841,424) in view of SanGiovanni (2002/0102946 A1) and Batio (5,949,643) and further in view of Helot et al. (6,185,095 B1). Applicant has reviewed Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio and Helot, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 13, and 20 are not obvious in view of Kikinis, SanGiovanni, Batio, and Helot, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 3 is dependent on Independent Claim 1, Claim 13 is dependent on Independent Claim 10, and Claim 20 is dependent on Independent Claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that

the rejection of Claims 3, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Claims 7-8, 16-17, and 25-26

Claims 7-8, 16-17, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,841,424) in view of SanGiovanni (2002/0102946 A1) and Batio (5,949,643) and further in view of Madsen et al. (6,181,284 B1). Applicant has reviewed Kikinis in view of SanGiovanni and Batio and Madsen, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 7-8, 16-17, and 25-26 are not obvious in view of Kikinis, SanGiovanni, Batio, and Madsen, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 7-8 are dependent on Independent Claim 1, Claims 16-17 are dependent on Independent Claim 10, and Claims 25-26 are dependent on Independent Claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 7-8, 16-17, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18 and 20-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Date: 10/22/2003

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060